

COURTS IN GRAHAM COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN 2016-2018 SUMMARY



LOCAL INITIATIVES, DRIVERS, AND PRESSURES

- Improve courtroom infrastructure to accommodate videoconferencing and remote video interpreting.
- Continue to improve availability of useful information to the public through the Internet.
- Improve public information on local websites via interactive applications and video content.
- Address facilities challenges by moving Safford Municipal Court and expanding Pima Justice Court.
- Continue to digitize paper records, especially older ones and destroy records no longer needed.

CY 2013/14 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Completed extensive remodeling effort at county courthouse to create new administrative hearing room and additional space in Clerk's Office.
- Re-implemented FARE at Superior Court and created collections position in Adult Probation.
- Connected Thatcher Muni Court to jail via videoconferencing for IAs; Safford and Pima JPs switched to Polycom videoconferencing equipment to improve quality.
- Safford Muni Court implemented Liberty audio recording.
- Pima JP implemented disconnected scanning, including back scanning of closed cases.
- Continued sharing field trainer with Greenlee County courts.

Statewide Projects: Impacts, Concerns, and Participation Plans

LJ CMS	Recognize the need and advantages; will be late-cycle adopters.
JOLTSaz	Generally positive assessment; concern about functionality of the planned interface; will be a mid-cycle adopter.
LJ EDMS	Pima Justice implemented disconnected scanning to support e-filing and Safford Justice shows interest; muni courts will be late adopters.
e-Filing/Std Forms	Recognize importance of e-filing but need to improve business practices first; will be late adopters.
Bench Auto Architecture Risk	Superior court willing to be early adopters; other courts late adopters. Don't perform local development; county replaced Novell and GroupWise. Some courts still using Omni Forms package; Safford JP considering standalone OnBase vs disconnected scanning.

TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS					
Project	Year/ Status	Project Detail Provided			Comments
		Full¹	Skeletal²	Mention³	
EDMS	FY16		X		Justice Court Precinct #1; local JCEF
Hardware/Software Solutions for Videoconferencing	FY17		X		Superior Court, Pima Justice, Thatcher Muni with jail
Upgrade Digital Audio	FY16		X		Superior Court; improve quality of recording
Facility Video Surveillance	FY18		X		Superior Court
Video Remote Interpreting	FY16		X		Superior Court/AOC
Website Upgrade	FY16		X		Superior Court/Thatcher Muni
New Court Building	FY15		X		Safford Muni move

Note 1:

An “X” in “Full” indicates that the court has provided full detailed information about the project according to the general parameters outlined in the Commission on Technology’s Project Management Methodology. Also, risk analysis, impact, project costs and funding information has been provided.

Note 2:

An “X” in “Skeletal” indicates that the court provided detail about the local project in the master projects listing spreadsheet. Complete information, usually risks, impact analysis, project costs and funding, was not provided.

Note 3:

An “X” in “Mention” indicates that the court mentioned this project in a summary or listed it in an initiative. It may have been a phrase or a full paragraph of description, but did not contain detailed project-oriented information. If these projects are related to pursuing standards or directions already adopted (e.g., OnBase EDMS implementation, Jury+ upgrade, digital audio in the courtroom), then any mention which includes appropriate funding information is sufficient.